

### **REMARKS**

Claims 2-24 and 26-28 are now pending in the application. By this Paper, Claims 26 and 27 have been amended. The basis for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings originally filed. No new matter has been added. The preceding amendments and the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Muir (U.S. Pat. No. 6,251,660). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that the disclosure in Muir of chamber portions being joined with each other by an “adequately tight push fit” is a disclosure that the chamber portions are slidable relative to each other. See the Advisory Action dated April 4, 2011 at Page 2. While the Examiner acknowledges that the “tight push fit” of Muir is intended to prevent sliding of the chamber portions relative to each other during operation, the Examiner asserts that the tight push fit nevertheless allows the chamber portions to be disassembled from each other by sliding. See the Advisory Action dated April 4, 2011 at Pages 2-3.

Applicants note that independent Claims 26 recites, in part, that adjacent chamber portions along a row are slidable relative to each other while maintaining the

sampling and assay device in an assembled condition. Independent Claim 27 recites, in part, that at least one intermediate chamber portion and a further end chamber portion are connected in a row and slidable relative to each other while maintaining the sampling and assay device in an assembled condition. Applicants respectfully submit that Muir fails to disclose or suggest adjacent chamber portions being slidable relative to each other while maintaining a sampling and assay device in an assembled condition, as the Examiner appears to acknowledge. Unlike the claimed device, sliding the chamber portions of Muir relative to each other would result in disassembly of the device.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 26 and 27, as well as Claim 28, which is dependent upon Claim 27, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

#### **ALLOWED CLAIMS**

Applicants gratefully acknowledge allowed Claims 2-24.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 19, 2011

By: /Michael Malinzak/  
Michael Malinzak, Reg. No. 43,770

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MM/SDW/cg

16030986.1